

As the Foreign Operation Subcommittee prepares to enter into a conference with the other body, I hope that my fellow conferees will take a moment to read the following editorial, which appeared in today's Washington Times.

This editorial illustrates the danger of basing our foreign policy on ethnic head counts in our districts, instead of the national security concerns of the United States. I sincerely hope that we can pursue a policy of friendship and cooperation with the Government of Turkey, and thereby ensure a long-lasting and mutually beneficial relationship between our two nations.

FORSAKING A VALUED BULWARK TO
EXTREMISM

(By Amos Perlmutter)

It's generally acknowledged that Turkey is one of the key, critical strategic states in the Middle East, yet that acknowledgement seems to have escaped the United States in recent times.

Challenged by both internal and external forces, Turkish Prime Minister Tansu Ciller resigned after losing a vote of confidence on Sunday. The future of her Government—Turkey's friendliest to the U.S. in a long time—poses serious challenges to American foreign policy in the Middle East.

As far back as 1954, the United States and Great Britain helped engineer the Northern Tier, a North Asian political bulwark and fortress against the Soviet Union in the depths of the Cold War. The leading elements of the tier then were Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and Iraq, seen as partners to the West in the Cold War against the Soviet Union.

Turkey, which stands between Europe and Asia and controls the Black Sea passage to the Mediterranean did more than its part. It made a real and still vivid contribution to the Korean War by delivering its legendary tough soldiers, who displayed conspicuous heroism. Turkey today remains a critical member of NATO and stands in key contrast to Iran, Iraq, Syria and the Muslim states of the former Soviet Union.

Given its critical importance and its basically steadfast history, it seems more than passing strange that the United States has never fully acknowledged or rewarded the contributions and importance of Turkey, including its key participation in the Gulf war, by allowing the use of its air space.

Why this casual treatment of Turkey? Some of the explanations for the American failure to recognize the importance of Turkey's strategic role in the Middle East have their roots in the workings of Congress, where the domestic lobbies of Armenia and Greece hold sway in a ferocious battle against Turkish influence. In fact, the specter of Sen. Robert Dole's candidacy bodes no good for Turkey. Mr. Dole, who was horribly wounded in World War II, was saved by the heroic medical efforts of an Armenian physician, a personal fact that appears to have influenced Mr. Dole's policy toward Turkey. Even without Mr. Dole, the Armenian lobby has been very effective in preventing Turkey from gaining the full economic fruits and benefits of the European Economic Community.

The even more powerful Greek lobby has managed to help relegate Turkey's image in the public eye to that of a non-European Muslim and Ottoman state that bears little resemblance to the reality of modern Turkey. In fact, Turkey's civic culture since the Kemalist revolution after World War I is that of a secular state, even if it is, like so many other countries in the region, burdened by the threat of an emerging radical, Islamic and Kurdish opposition.

The problem for Turkey is that it has so far displayed no gift for the kind of lobbying and public proselytizing that is characteristic of the Greek and Armenian efforts. Turkish-Americans are spread throughout the United States and form no cohesive voting or social bloc. The absence of a natural and organized lobby and the challenge presented by the organized Greek and Armenian lobbies have combined to result in a hesitant U.S. support for Turkey, despite its history and its strategic importance, which is greater than Greece.

The persistent complaint is that Turkey is not a real democracy, an argument that can be applied more correctly to the corrupt regime of Prime Minister Andreas Papandreu of Greece, a former sympathizer of the Soviet Union and of anti-American Third World radicals and terrorists. It's true that neither Greece nor Turkey are complete democracies on the order of the United States or Britain, but a good case can be made for Turkey on its substantive political and social culture, which is characterized by a history of civility, an absence of racism and anti-Semitism and a certain steadfastness to allies ever since the collapse of the Ottoman Empire.

It's true that the Ottoman Empire, once called "the Sick Man of Europe" was an abusive and corrupt empire. Yet even then, its system of vilayat rule allowed considerable autonomy and achieved more tolerance for religious groups than other empires of its time.

Today, Turkey is marked for its civility, and is important as a strategic partner. Most of the vestiges of the Ottoman Empire have long since vanished in the wake of the work of the model military reformist Kamal Ataturk, who is the father of modern, secular Turkey. Turkey, in fact, is the only secular Muslim state in the world today, a not unremarkable feat and status.

Turkey ought to be rewarded instead of ignored for its secularization efforts. True, Turkey must find a better way to deal with its Kurdish problem, although its current approach is relatively moderate, compared to the way Iraq treats its Kurdish minority. The Turkish government should probably do its utmost to recognize the Kurds, although not the PKP revolutionary Marxist group, as equal citizens.

Still, the reasons for American disinterest have more to do with domestic American lobbying activities than any real or perceived Turkish failings. It's high time the United States woke up to the strategic and critical importance of Turkey. The easiest way to do that is to imagine Turkey in the hands of fundamentalist Islamic forces. The opposite is true today—Turkey stands as a real and honest bulwark to the forces of radical and fundamentalist Islam.

EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1995

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from the First District of California, Representative RIGGS, in supporting an extension of State jurisdiction into the exclusive economic zone [EEZ] for the States of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and California. Certain fisheries, such as Dungeness crab, scallops, and thresher shark are not covered by a Federal fishery management plan [FMP]. States lack the authority to manage these fisheries while the Pacific Fishery Management Council

and NMFS lack the resources to manage them. In the absence of management and conservation authority, these fisheries can easily be exploited by fishermen fishing exclusively in the EEZ and then landing the product in State or foreign nation without landing laws addressing that species of fish. The bill as it is currently written grants authority to manage in the EEZ to Alaska. I am hopeful that similar authority will be granted to Washington, Oregon, and California. I applaud the commitment by Representative YOUNG to work toward resolution of this issue.

WHO WILL NOTICE?

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, lately there has been a great deal of rhetoric about train wrecks and other analogies to cataclysmic events to describe the impending doom to the Nation's financial markets should the Government shut down if Congress and President Clinton disagree on a Federal budget. I believe that most of the gloom and doom forecasts come from bureaucrats and Democrats who generally overstate the importance of Washington to the rest of the Nation.

As far as I am concerned, the shutdown of non-essential Federal agencies would constitute the fulfillment of my mission as a Member of Congress. However, in the past, the Government has, in fact, shut down temporarily as Congress and the President fought over the details of the funding for the Federal agencies. I suspect that, outside the Capital Beltway, no one noticed when it was shut down.

In a recent Wall Street Journal article, Jim Miller, the former director of the Office of Management and Budget, also argues that no one, even those on Wall Street, will notice if the Federal Government temporarily shuts down during budget negotiations.

As we in Congress continue to convince President Clinton of the necessity to balance the Federal budget, I commend Mr. Miller's article, "Government Shutdown? 'See If Anybody Notices'" to my colleagues for reassurance.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN? 'SEE IF ANYBODY
NOTICES'

(By James C. Miller III)

Washington is reaching the end game on the budget. The White House wants Congress to compromise on—read, back off—a budget that simultaneously cuts taxes by \$245 billion, pays dollar for dollar for those tax cuts with spending cuts, and balances the books by the year 2002. In a fit of rhetorical overkill, the Clinton administration has warned of a "train wreck" that will shut the government down and shake the financial markets if no agreement is reached by Nov. 15.

In fact, the so-called train wreck would be more of a fender bender. The law is quite clear: There would be no shutdown—only "non-essential services" would be curtailed. The armed forces would stand ready as ever; social security checks would be mailed on time (and the post office would deliver them along with all other mail); air traffic controllers and meat inspectors would stay on the job. The fact is, the government has